AMERICANS ON IMMIGRATION REFORM
– QUESTIONNAIRE –

JANUARY 2019

Fielded by: Nielsen Scarborough **Fielding Dates:** October 1-16, 2018
Sample Size: 2,407 registered voters **Margin of Error:** Each Half-Sample: 2.8%; Full Sample: +/- 2.0%

*Note: Text in Brackets was not presented to respondents

Currently there is much debate about the US immigration system. Today we are first going to evaluate a number of options for changing the US system for legal immigration. The US system for legal immigration provides selected non-US citizens with the right to reside in the United States on a permanent basis by providing them with what is commonly known as a "green card." This also gives them the right to work and the obligation to pay taxes.

As you will see, some people argue that the number of legal immigrants to the US should be reduced, others say the number should be increased.

[THE SAMPLE WAS RANDOMLY SEPARATED INTO TWO HALF SAMPLES; SAMPLE A AND SAMPLE B]

[FULL SAMPLE]
There are also proposals for changing the way that immigrants are selected. In each case, you will be presented information about the proposal, offered arguments in favor of and against that proposal, which you will evaluate how convincing or unconvincing you find them, and then you will be asked to evaluate that proposal. Here is some background:

Currently, there are debates about whether for some of the categories of people currently being allowed to get green cards the number of green cards granted should be reduced or even whether the category should be eliminated.

Some of the categories being considered for reduction or elimination are part of the 'family-based program' that allows US citizens and to a lesser extent US permanent residents (i.e. green card holders) to request green cards for family members. Here are approximately how many people are being given green cards each year under this program:

Adult children of US citizens	49,000
Adult children of US permanent residents	26,000
Siblings of US citizens	65,000
Parents of US citizens	175,000

Another category of immigrants being considered for reduction or elimination are from a program that accepts applications from people in countries that are not widely represented in the US population, sometimes called the 'diversity lottery.' About 50,000 people (includes applicants plus their immediate family) receive green cards through this program.

There is also a debate about a proposal to <u>increase</u> the number of people getting green cards in a certain program. This program selects people who have skills employers seek or are investors who plan to start a business. About 140,000 (includes applicants plus their immediate family) receive green cards through this program.

In addition to these programs, approximately 490,000 green cards are also given to the spouses and minor children of US citizens and permanent residents. However, right now, there are no proposals for changing this program.

We are now going to evaluate some arguments in favor of reducing the total number of people who receive green cards and in each case the counter argument as well.

Q1. Letting in so many foreigners creates a larger supply of workers, which creates more competition for Americans who are already here. Immigrants have been coming in at a pace that is faster than the growth of the population. Many Americans have even given up trying to get a job. While unemployment may be lower now, when unemployment was high, the government kept letting in new people. Government policymakers are doing what is good for corporations who want an overabundant supply of cheap labor, but they are not doing what is good for American workers.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	22.0%	31.3%	53.3%	24.5%	21.1%	45.6%	1.0%
GOP	33.7%	36.7%	70.4%	19.4%	9.4%	28.8%	0.8%
Dem.	12.0%	26.6%	38.6%	27.4%	32.3%	59.7%	1.7%
Indep.	20.2%	30.7%	50.9%	29.2%	19.9%	49.1%	0.0%
March 2018							
National	22.3%	33.2%	55.5%	22.5%	21.8%	44.3%	0.3%
GOP	33.0%	36.7%	69.7%	17.8%	12.1%	29.9%	0.4%
Dem.	11.1%	27.9%	39.0%	28.5%	32.3%	60.8%	0.2%
Indep.	26.0%	37.6%	63.6%	18.3%	17.8%	36.1%	0.3%

Q2. A large bipartisan group of economists recently issued a statement saying that cutting immigration would slow the economy, which would lower the demand for all workers. The size of the workforce has been declining lately, with many baby boomers retiring and the birth-rates declining. Immigrants can help fill the gap. Many immigrants are entrepreneurs and investors who create jobs by starting their own businesses. A remarkable 43 percent of the Fortune 500 companies were founded or co-founded by an immigrant or the child of an immigrant, including Apple, eBay, Intel, Yahoo and Google. Immigrants also do jobs American do not want to do, complementing rather than directly competing with American workers. Clearly, we should not reduce the vital flow of immigrants into our economy.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	26.7%	34.5%	61.2%	23.3%	14.8%	38.1%	0.6%
GOP	9.3%	32.9%	42.2%	31.6%	25.4%	57.0%	0.9%
Dem.	45.2%	34.3%	79.5%	15.0%	5.0%	20.0%	0.4%
Indep.	20.5%	38.4%	58.9%	25.2%	15.4%	40.6%	0.6%
March 2018							
National	24.0%	35.7%	59.7%	22.3%	17.6%	39.9%	0.3%
GOP	7.8%	30.7%	38.5%	31.1%	29.8%	60.9%	0.5%
Dem.	42.6%	41.4%	84.0%	11.4%	4.5%	15.9%	0.2%
Indep.	15.0%	33.1%	48.1%	29.2%	22.5%	51.7%	0.2%

Q3. Because immigrants increase the supply of labor, companies are put in a stronger position that allows them to keep wages lower than they would otherwise be. Over the years, as immigration has increased, workers have lost leverage and worker protections have gotten weaker. Since the 1970s American workers have seen their wages stagnate even as the economy has grown, and workers productivity has increased; while more money has gone to the shareholders. Slowing the rate of immigration will help American workers get better pay so that they can earn a decent living, especially for the poorest workers at the bottom of the labor market.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	22.1%	34.1%	56.2%	26.2%	16.2%	42.4%	1.4%
GOP	32.1%	40.4%	72.5%	21.0%	5.3%	26.3%	1.2%
Dem.	13.7%	27.8%	41.5%	31.5%	25.4%	56.9%	1.6%
Indep.	20.2%	35.6%	55.8%	25.1%	17.9%	43.0%	1.3%
March 2018							
National	22.1%	38.0%	60.1%	23.7%	15.9%	39.6%	0.4%

GOP	29.8%	43.9%	**73.7%**	19.1%	6.6%	**25.7%**	0.6%
Dem.	13.7%	31.3%	**45.0%**	29.7%	25.1%	**54.8%**	0.3%
Indep.	25.4%	41.0%	**66.4%**	19.6%	13.7%	**33.3%**	0.2%

Q4. Slowing the rate of immigration will slow the economy. This will diminish wages for all American workers, not help them. In many ways, immigrants do not compete with citizen workers, but rather complement them, for example by providing low-cost childcare and house care, they allow citizens to pursue better economic opportunities. Immigration also drives up wages for native-born citizens by increasing the demand for their native skills such as full command of the English language, making it more likely they will be in managerial or higher paid positions.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	14.3%	32.3%	**46.6%**	31.8%	20.1%	**51.9%**	1.5%
GOP	4.8%	22.5%	**27.3%**	38.4%	32.9%	**71.3%**	1.4%
Dem.	23.7%	40.8%	**64.5%**	25.0%	8.8%	**33.8%**	1.7%
Indep.	12.2%	33.3%	**45.5%**	33.7%	19.3%	**53.0%**	1.5%
March 2018							
National	11.7%	30.9%	**42.6%**	34.2%	23.0%	**57.2%**	0.3%
GOP	4.7%	20.2%	**24.9%**	39.7%	35.1%	**74.8%**	0.3%
Dem.	20.3%	44.5%	**64.8%**	25.1%	9.9%	**35.0%**	0.2%
Indep.	6.6%	21.6%	**28.2%**	43.4%	27.9%	**71.3%**	0.5%

Q5. Immigrants are a major burden on our government budgets. When they come here, they often need a lot of social services. Because some do not speak English, schools and social programs need to provide them special help which is costly. They send their children to public schools, they can go on Medicaid, and they can get food stamps. Studies show households headed by legal immigrants are more likely to use at least one welfare program than households headed by citizens. It is unfair to citizens, who have been paying taxes their entire life, to support waves of new families dependent on public welfare.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	38.3%	22.8%	**61.1%**	15.2%	21.2%	**36.4%**	2.4%
GOP	62.5%	21.8%	**84.3%**	8.4%	4.6%	**13.0%**	2.7%
Dem.	17.8%	23.0%	**40.8%**	20.5%	36.3%	**56.8%**	2.4%
Indep.	34.6%	24.3%	**58.9%**	17.6%	21.7%	**39.3%**	1.8%
March 2018							
National	40.3%	23.8%	**64.1%**	15.6%	19.6%	**35.2%**	0.7%
GOP	63.0%	24.4%	**87.4%**	6.6%	5.6%	**12.2%**	0.6%
Dem.	17.7%	23.2%	**40.9%**	23.0%	35.3%	**58.3%**	0.7%
Indep.	45.4%	24.1%	**69.5%**	17.3%	12.5%	**29.8%**	0.6%

Q6. Welfare for new immigrants is severely restricted. Studies show that, while first-generation legal immigrants sometimes need more than average social services while getting established, eventually they need fewer services and pay as much in taxes as citizens. Immigrants are energetic, motivated people. Leaving your home and coming to a whole new country is not the kind of thing that passive, dependent people do. Contrary to stereotypes, legal immigrants are also better educated than average Americans and better-educated immigrants pay more in taxes, in addition to their economic contributions.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	23.7%	32.4%	**56.1%**	23.2%	18.5%	**41.7%**	2.1%
GOP	7.6%	28.1%	**35.7%**	30.4%	31.4%	**61.8%**	2.6%
Dem.	40.5%	34.7%	**75.2%**	16.1%	6.8%	**22.9%**	1.8%
Indep.	18.7%	36.7%	**55.4%**	24.7%	18.2%	**42.9%**	1.8%
March 2018							
National	23.6%	32.2%	**55.8%**	23.9%	19.8%	**43.7%**	0.4%
GOP	7.9%	27.4%	**35.3%**	30.1%	34.1%	**64.2%**	0.5%
Dem.	40.5%	37.1%	**77.6%**	16.3%	5.7%	**22.0%**	0.4%
Indep.	17.5%	31.0%	**48.5%**	28.3%	22.9%	**51.2%**	0.2%

Q7. Immigrants, even legal ones, pose a danger to our communities. They are more likely to be young and male -- a group that has historically been more prone to criminal activity. Many are new arrivals and checking criminal records from foreign countries is not reliable. We should not be taking the risk of potentially letting more crime into our communities.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	16.5%	24.1%	**40.6%**	23.0%	35.6%	**58.6%**	0.8%
GOP	27.7%	34.2%	**61.9%**	27.1%	10.4%	**37.5%**	0.6%
Dem.	7.7%	14.6%	**22.3%**	18.2%	58.6%	**76.8%**	0.9%
Indep.	12.7%	25.1%	**37.8%**	25.5%	35.5%	**61.0%**	1.2%
March 2018							
National	17.5%	24.3%	**41.8%**	21.5%	36.5%	**58.0%**	0.2%
GOP	28.2%	36.2%	**64.4%**	22.1%	13.5%	**35.6%**	0.0%
Dem.	5.8%	14.5%	**20.3%**	19.5%	59.7%	**79.2%**	0.5%
Indep.	22.0%	22.4%	**44.4%**	24.9%	30.6%	**55.5%**	0.1%

Q8. Applicants undergo four separate background checks with the FBI and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to screen against terrorism, sex offenses, active arrest warrants and gang affiliations. More significantly, according to an in-depth study by the National Academy of Sciences, legal immigrants do not commit crimes at a higher rate than native-born citizens. It is a myth that legal immigrants pose a unique danger.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	35.2%	32.1%	**67.3%**	18.1%	13.5%	**31.6%**	1.1%
GOP	14.3%	35.0%	**49.3%**	27.2%	22.7%	**49.9%**	0.8%
Dem.	57.5%	28.0%	**85.5%**	8.3%	4.7%	**13.0%**	1.5%
Indep.	27.0%	35.7%	**62.7%**	21.8%	14.5%	**36.3%**	1.0%
March 2018							
National	33.7%	31.5%	**65.2%**	19.3%	15.3%	**34.6%**	0.2%
GOP	13.8%	31.7%	**45.5%**	30.2%	24.2%	**54.4%**	0.2%
Dem.	56.8%	29.2%	**86.0%**	8.2%	5.5%	**13.7%**	0.4%
Indep.	21.9%	36.1%	**58.0%**	22.6%	19.4%	**42.0%**	0.0%

Q9. Allowing in immigrants increases the risk of terrorism against Americans. Between 1975 and 2015, 54 green card holders were convicted of terrorist attacks and eight people died from those attacks. Even more have been charged with terrorist-related activities. Large immigrant populations make it easier for terrorists to operate in the US and go unnoticed. This risk is unacceptable. If we reduce the number of foreigners moving into the country, we will lower the risk of terrorist attacks.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	20.3%	27.3%	**47.6%**	21.7%	28.6%	**50.3%**	2.0%
GOP	35.7%	33.4%	**69.1%**	21.5%	7.2%	**28.7%**	2.2%
Dem.	9.0%	20.2%	**29.2%**	21.7%	47.3%	**69.0%**	1.8%
Indep.	13.6%	31.0%	**44.6%**	22.2%	31.0%	**53.2%**	2.1%
March 2018							
National	20.4%	28.1%	**48.5%**	22.0%	28.8%	**50.8%**	0.6%
GOP	35.7%	38.0%	**73.7%**	18.6%	7.4%	**26.0%**	0.3%
Dem.	6.7%	17.5%	**24.2%**	24.3%	50.3%	**74.6%**	1.2%
Indep.	20.5%	32.2%	**52.7%**	23.6%	23.6%	**47.2%**	0.1%

Q10. Between 1975 and 2015, 35 million people were granted green cards and 54 of them were convicted of terrorist attacks--that's 0.00016%. We cannot let a small number of terrorists scare the US into closing its doors to the world. We can, however, have thorough vetting to ensure that all the people we let in pose no security threat. Currently, such vetting includes multiple background checks, a process so thorough that it can take up to two years.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	37.6%	34.5%	**72.1%**	15.5%	10.4%	**25.9%**	1.9%

GOP	19.3%	40.1%	**59.4%**	21.8%	17.0%	**38.8%**	1.8%
Dem.	56.7%	29.1%	**85.8%**	9.0%	3.1%	**12.1%**	2.1%
Indep.	31.7%	35.3%	**67.0%**	17.4%	13.8%	**31.2%**	1.8%
March 2018							
National	38.3%	33.7%	**72.0%**	15.6%	11.8%	**27.4%**	0.5%
GOP	20.4%	35.2%	**55.6%**	24.2%	19.3%	**43.5%**	0.9%
Dem.	58.8%	32.0%	**90.8%**	6.2%	2.8%	**9.0%**	0.2%
Indep.	28.5%	34.6%	**63.1%**	19.2%	17.0%	**36.2%**	0.6%

[SAMPLE B]

Q10a: So now, what would you say should be done about the number of green cards issued each year. Do you think they should be:

	Reduced a lot	Reduced some	Total Reduced	Kept the same	Total Increased	Increased some	Increased a lot	Refused / Don't know
National	22.8%	25.4%	**48.2%**	**30.9%**	**20.8%**	14.5%	6.3%	0.1%
GOP	37.2%	30.3%	**67.5%**	**24.4%**	**8.2%**	7.1%	1.1%	0.0%
Dem.	10.2%	17.9%	**28.1%**	**37.2%**	**34.7%**	23.3%	11.4%	0.1%
Indep.	19.4%	33.5%	**52.9%**	**31.1%**	**15.8%**	9.8%	6.0%	0.2%

[SAMPLE A]

We are now going to evaluate some proposals for reducing the number of legal immigrants.

The first set of proposals is to reduce the number of immigrants in the 'family-sponsored' program that lets US citizens request green cards for their parents, siblings and adult children and allows permanent residents to request green cards for their adult children. Applicants must undergo medical examinations to ensure that they do not have serious health problems and must pass criminal background checks.

Q11. Immigrants who are granted green cards because they have family members here do not necessarily have any qualifications that are needed in our economy. This has led to an increase in immigrants competing with citizens, which can drive down wages. About a third of these immigrants are parents of citizens who are older and closer to retirement--they contribute less to our economy and are a burden on our healthcare system. Immigrants' children have to be educated in our schools at taxpayers' expense.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	24.5%	31.3%	**55.8%**	23.7%	19.6%	**43.3%**	0.9%
GOP	44.6%	37.3%	**81.9%**	12.4%	5.1%	**17.5%**	0.6%
Dem.	11.4%	26.1%	**37.5%**	32.5%	29.1%	**61.6%**	0.9%
Indep.	14.9%	31.4%	**46.3%**	26.1%	26.2%	**52.3%**	1.4%
March 2018							
National	26.9%	34.5%	**61.4%**	21.6%	16.5%	**38.1%**	0.4%
GOP	44.2%	37.7%	**81.9%**	12.5%	5.0%	**17.5%**	0.6%
Dem.	10.7%	31.2%	**41.9%**	28.7%	29.2%	**57.9%**	0.3%
Indep.	28.7%	35.7%	**64.4%**	24.1%	11.3%	**35.4%**	0.1%

Q12. When immigrants come to America, it is useful for them to have extended families and a larger community of people from their home countries. This network helps new immigrants navigate in their new country and can provide employment or the resources to start a small business. Having grandparents, and other extended family members, is positive for children's development and by providing childcare and other assistance, they can enable the parents to work full-time. These workers then pay taxes and contribute to the economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	25.8%	34.3%	**60.1%**	23.2%	15.8%	**39.0%**	0.8%
GOP	8.5%	28.4%	**36.9%**	34.0%	28.6%	**62.6%**	0.5%
Dem.	44.5%	35.0%	**79.5%**	13.8%	5.5%	**19.3%**	1.2%
Indep.	17.8%	44.4%	**62.2%**	23.0%	14.1%	**37.1%**	0.7%
March 2018							

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	22.8%	33.9%	**56.7%**	23.1%	19.6%	**42.7%**	0.5%
GOP	8.2%	26.2%	**34.4%**	30.4%	34.2%	**64.6%**	1.0%
Dem.	39.3%	41.2%	**80.5%**	13.8%	5.4%	**19.2%**	0.2%
Indep.	15.2%	33.0%	**48.2%**	29.6%	22.1%	**51.7%**	0.1%

Q13. This program favors the nationalities of the people who are already here, which is unfair, and leads to the creation of large ethnic communities that do not always integrate culturally. Often times, people in these communities do not have to learn English and isolate themselves. The whole idea of America as a melting pot is lost and the cohesion of society is diminished.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	26.9%	28.0%	**54.9%**	22.3%	21.5%	**43.8%**	1.2%
GOP	46.2%	31.8%	**78.0%**	14.9%	6.2%	**21.1%**	1.0%
Dem.	13.3%	23.4%	**36.7%**	27.2%	35.0%	**62.2%**	1.0%
Indep.	19.9%	31.0%	**50.9%**	25.9%	21.0%	**46.9%**	2.1%
March 2018							
National	27.5%	31.6%	**59.1%**	23.4%	17.0%	**40.4%**	0.5%
GOP	46.0%	30.3%	**76.3%**	17.1%	6.3%	**23.4%**	0.3%
Dem.	10.0%	29.3%	**39.3%**	30.9%	29.0%	**59.9%**	0.8%
Indep.	29.5%	39.3%	**68.8%**	19.3%	11.8%	**31.1%**	0.1%

Q14. First, with time immigrants do assimilate more, especially as their children learn English. Second, the idea of America is not to make everybody the same. People from other cultures provide a fresh perspective that is part of the vitality of American culture. It makes life here more interesting and has contributed to the innovations that have been key to the success of our country.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	29.5%	32.6%	**62.1%**	21.0%	14.8%	**35.8%**	2.2%
GOP	8.6%	29.4%	**38.0%**	33.2%	28.2%	**61.4%**	0.8%
Dem.	48.2%	34.1%	**82.3%**	10.9%	3.7%	**14.6%**	3.0%
Indep.	28.6%	35.3%	**63.9%**	19.7%	13.4%	**33.1%**	3.1%
March 2018							
National	25.9%	34.1%	**60.0%**	23.5%	16.0%	**39.5%**	0.6%
GOP	9.0%	28.5%	**37.5%**	34.4%	27.4%	**61.8%**	0.6%
Dem.	44.4%	38.9%	**83.3%**	12.7%	3.3%	**16.0%**	0.5%
Indep.	18.1%	34.2%	**52.3%**	25.9%	21.3%	**47.2%**	0.5%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Now, having considered these arguments, we would like to know what you would recommend for the various categories of people in the family-based program.

Q15. First, let's consider the part of the program that provides about 49,000 green cards for the adult children of US citizens. Here are the options:
1. Not granting any green cards
2. Reducing the number
3. Keeping the current number of about 49,000
4. Increasing the number

	1. Not granting any green cards	2. Reducing the number	3. Keeping the current number of about 49,000	4. Increasing the number	Refused / Don't know
National	8.2%	32.8%	36.6%	20.2%	2.2%
GOP	14.0%	52.4%	25.9%	6.0%	1.6%
Dem.	2.5%	17.9%	46.2%	30.8%	2.7%
Indep.	9.6%	28.1%	36.2%	23.9%	2.2%

[THOSE WHO SAID "Reducing the Number" ON Q15, WERE PRESENTED Q15A]

Q15a. What do you think the number of green cards granted each year for **adult children of US citizens** should be? (Currently the number is about 49,000 a year.)

	Median	% of Total Sample Responding
National	20,000	31%
GOP	25,000	50%
Dem.	20,000	17%
Indep.	20,000	25%

Q16. Now let's consider the part of the program that provides about 26,000 green cards for the **adult children of permanent residents**. Here are the options:
1. Not granting any green cards
2. Reducing the number
3. Keeping the current number of about 26,000
4. Increasing the number

	1. Not granting any green cards	2. Reducing the number	3. Keeping the current number of about 26,000	4. Increasing the number	Refused / Don't know
National	13.0%	22.1%	40.0%	23.4%	1.5%
GOP	21.9%	34.2%	36.1%	6.2%	1.7%
Dem.	4.6%	13.2%	42.9%	37.6%	1.7%
Indep.	14.3%	18.5%	41.5%	25.2%	0.5%

[THOSE WHO SAID "Reducing the Number" ON Q16, WERE PRESENTED Q16A]

Q16a. What do you think the number of green cards granted each year under this program should be? (Currently the number is about 26,000 a year.) _____?

	Median	% of Total Sample Responding
National	10,000	20%
GOP	12,000	32%
Dem.	15,000	12%
Indep.	10,000	18%
March 2018	**Median**	
National	14,000	
GOP	13,500	
Dem.	15,000	
Indep.	13,500	

Q17. Now let's consider the part of the program that provides about 65,000 green cards for **siblings (i.e. brothers and sisters) of US citizens**. Here are the options:
1. Not granting any green cards
2. Reducing the number
3. Keeping the current number of about 65,000
4. Increasing the number

	1. Not granting any green cards	2. Reducing the number	3. Keeping the current number of about 65,000	4. Increasing the number	Refused / Don't know
National	15.6%	29.9%	31.0%	20.2%	3.3%
GOP	27.7%	45.2%	19.6%	4.2%	3.2%
Dem.	5.7%	18.1%	39.4%	33.8%	2.9%
Indep.	14.0%	26.4%	34.5%	21.1%	4.0%

[THOSE WHO SAID "Reducing the Number" ON Q17, WERE PRESENTED Q17A]

Q17a. What do you think the number of green cards granted each year under this program should be? (Currently the number is about 65,000 a year.) _____?

	Median	% of Total Sample Responding
National	30,000	28%
GOP	30,000	43%
Dem.	32,000	17%
Indep.	25,000	25%

Q18. Turning now to the parents of US citizens, first it should be clarified that there is not a formal limit on the number of green cards going to them. However, the actual number of green cards granted is about 175,000. Here are the options:
1. Not granting any green cards
2. Creating a limit at a lower level than the number currently being granted
3. Keeping the current system which grants about 175,000

	1. Not granting any green cards	2. Creating a limit at a lower level than the number currently being granted	3. Keeping the current system which grants about 175,000	Refused / Don't know
National	15.3%	36.7%	46.9%	1.1%
GOP	27.6%	51.8%	19.9%	0.7%
Dem.	4.7%	23.6%	70.0%	1.6%
Indep.	14.8%	36.8%	47.8%	0.6%

[THOSE WHO SAID "Creating a limit at a lower level . . . ," FOR Q18 WERE PRESENTED Q18A]
Q18a. What do you think the number of green cards granted each year under this program should be? (Currently the number is about 175,000 a year.) _____?

	Median	% of Total Sample Responding
National	75,000	34%
GOP	75,000	49%
Dem.	80,000	18%
Indep.	50,000	35%

For the parents of US citizens, an additional option has been proposed. It would replace the current program that provides green cards, to one that provides a special visa allowing parents to remain in the US for a 5 year period, which can then be renewed for additional 5 year periods. The parents would not be allowed to work and would not be eligible for Federal, state or local public health benefits, such as Medicare. The children, who are citizens, would be responsible for their parent's support and their healthcare.

Q19. Under the current system, when US citizens are able to get their parents a green card and bring them into the US, it can put a substantial burden on US taxpayers. Although these older people have not paid taxes to the government they are able to get government services, such as Medicare, which can be quite costly for the government. If US citizens want to bring in their parents, they must take responsibility for ensuring their financial support and that they will not need government-provided services such as healthcare, which is what this proposal does.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	39.7%	26.1%	**65.8%**	19.0%	15.0%	**34.0%**	0.2%
GOP	66.6%	22.7%	**89.3%**	7.3%	3.2%	**10.5%**	0.2%
Dem.	19.4%	28.8%	**48.2%**	26.3%	25.5%	**51.8%**	0.1%
Indep.	32.7%	26.8%	**59.5%**	25.5%	14.4%	**39.9%**	0.6%

Q20. This proposal puts the parents in a bind. They would not be allowed to work even though most of them would still be of working age, so that unless they are quite wealthy they would be dependent on their children. This would mean that only wealthy citizens would be able to bring their parents over. This would be discriminatory against low and middle income families—just the ones who are in particular need of help from their parents to raise their families. It would be better if these parents have the right to work and pay taxes and contribute to Social Security and Medicare.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	29.7%	32.4%	**62.1%**	19.4%	17.9%	**37.3%**	0.7%

GOP	8.5%	34.5%	**43.0%**	26.9%	28.7%	**55.6%**	1.4%
Dem.	49.4%	32.0%	**81.4%**	11.6%	6.8%	**18.4%**	0.3%
Indep.	27.1%	29.2%	**56.3%**	22.2%	21.6%	**43.8%**	0.0%

Q21. So, having considered these arguments, here is the proposal again: replacing the current program that provides green cards to parents of US citizens, to one that provides a special renewable visa allowing parents to remain in the US for 5 year periods. The parents would not be allowed to work and would not be eligible for Federal, state or local public benefits, such as Medicare. Their children would be responsible for their parent's support and their healthcare. Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Refused / Don't know
National	4.0	55.3%	12.9%	31.2%	0.6%
GOP	5.3	38.8%	15.1%	45.7%	0.4%
Dem.	2.8	68.4%	11.4%	19.5%	0.7%
Indep.	3.8	57.9%	11.7%	29.4%	1.0%

Q22. So, now with this additional option, for the parents of US citizens, do you favor:
1. Not granting any green cards
2. Putting a limit at a lower level than the number being currently granted
3. Keeping the current system which grants about 175,000 a year
4. Replacing the program that provides green cards with one that provides renewable 5 year visas which prohibit the parents from working and receiving any government benefits

	1. Not granting any green cards	2. Putting a limit at a lower level than the number being currently granted	3. Keeping the current system which grants about 175,000 a year	4. Replacing the program that provides green cards with one that provides renewable 5 year visas which prohibit the parents from working and receiving any government benefits	Refused / Don't know
National	10.5%	23.4%	40.6%	23.4%	2.0%
GOP	16.7%	31.1%	15.4%	33.6%	3.1%
Dem.	3.8%	17.4%	62.2%	15.4%	1.2%
Indep.	13.3%	22.0%	41.5%	21.7%	1.5%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q23. If any of these programs are ended, there is still the question of what should be done with the existing applications that have been accepted, but are in a waiting line to get their green card.

Which of these do you think would best?
1. Process all of the existing applications.
2. Process the existing applications that are scheduled to get green cards within the next year, but do not issue any more to those in the waiting line.
3. Immediately stop issuing anymore green cards for those in the waiting line

	1. Process all of the existing applicants	2. Process the existing applications that are scheduled to get green cards within the next year, but do not issue any more to those in the waiting line.	3. Immediately stop issuing anymore green cards for those in the waiting line	Refused / Don't know
National	56.6%	31.3%	11.6%	0.5%
GOP	38.4%	42.0%	19.1%	0.6%
Dem.	74.7%	20.9%	4.2%	0.1%
Indep.	51.8%	33.5%	13.6%	1.1%

Another proposal is to reduce or eliminate a program sometimes called the 'diversity lottery.'

This program is one that anyone from countries with low rates of immigration to the U.S. can apply for, though only a small number are selected. Last year 20 million people applied, while approximately 50,000 were granted green cards (includes applicants and their spouses and minor children). One of the aims of the program is to allow in some people from countries that are not well represented in the current US population.

Here is how it works. All applicants enter an online lottery. Those that are selected are then vetted as follows:
- Applicants must have at least a high school education or two years of work experience in an occupation that requires at least two years of training or experience.
- Applicants must undergo medical examinations to ensure that they do not have serious health problems.
- Applicants undergo four separate background checks with the FBI and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to screen against terrorism, sex offenses, active arrest warrants and gang affiliations.

Here are some arguments for and against reducing or eliminating this program:

Q24. The idea of randomly picking people from all over the world to come into the US makes no sense. These people have no connections here. They create competition for US workers and expose Americans to the risk of terrorism and crime. It is also not certain that they will be needed in the labor market. We should not be creating competition for American workers and risking our safety, just so we can have more diversity in our country.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	27.1%	25.7%	**52.8%**	21.2%	25.6%	**46.8%**	0.4%
GOP	46.2%	27.0%	**73.2%**	17.6%	9.1%	**26.7%**	0.1%
Dem.	13.9%	22.9%	**36.8%**	23.0%	39.6%	**62.6%**	0.5%
Indep.	19.6%	29.1%	**48.7%**	24.3%	26.6%	**50.9%**	0.4%
March 2018							
National	32.6%	25.8%	**58.4%**	19.3%	22.0%	**41.3%**	0.2%
GOP	53.1%	25.8%	**78.9%**	12.8%	8.1%	**20.9%**	0.3%
Dem.	12.3%	25.9%	**38.2%**	24.2%	37.5%	**61.7%**	0.2%
Indep.	37.4%	25.8%	**63.2%**	21.1%	15.5%	**36.6%**	0.2%

Q25. This program is a fair way to bring in new immigrants. It ensures that no one area of the world gets more access to the American Dream than others. Applicants are required to meet education and work experience requirements--nearly four in ten are professionals or experienced managers-- and are thoroughly vetted to ensure they pose no security risk. Our immigration system should not be based only on whether someone has family or employment connections.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	26.5%	38.0%	**64.5%**	17.8%	17.1%	**34.9%**	0.6%
GOP	14.7%	36.1%	**50.8%**	19.8%	29.0%	**48.8%**	0.4%
Dem.	39.1%	39.1%	**78.2%**	14.6%	6.4%	**21.0%**	0.8%
Indep.	21.4%	39.3%	**60.7%**	20.8%	17.9%	**38.7%**	0.6%
March 2018							
National	22.9%	36.5%	**59.4%**	20.5%	19.8%	**40.3%**	0.3%
GOP	11.1%	30.7%	**41.8%**	24.2%	33.9%	**58.1%**	0.1%
Dem.	36.0%	43.7%	**79.7%**	14.9%	5.0%	**19.9%**	0.4%
Indep.	17.4%	31.9%	**49.3%**	25.8%	24.7%	**50.5%**	0.3%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q26. Now, having considered these arguments, we would like to know what you would recommend for this program.
1. Keep the program as it is
2. Keep the program but reduce the number of green cards below the current 50,000 per year
3. Eliminate the program entirely

	1. Keep the program as it is	2. Keep the program but reduce the number of green cards below the current 50,000 per year	3. Eliminate the program entirely	Refused / Don't know
National	42.3%	31.2%	25.5%	0.9%
GOP	22.3%	37.5%	39.7%	0.4%
Dem.	59.5%	27.2%	11.7%	1.6%
Indep.	43.0%	27.9%	28.6%	0.4%
March 2018				
National	40.9%	25.2%	33.2%	0.7%

GOP	19.3%	28.2%	52.1%	0.5%
Dem.	65.0%	21.8%	12.6%	0.6%
Indep.	30.3%	26.9%	41.5%	1.3%

[THOSE WHO SAID "Keep the program but reduce the number…" FOR Q26 WERE PRESENTED Q26A]
Q26a. What do you think the number of green cards granted each year under this program should be? (Currently the number is about 50,000 a year.) _____?

	Median	% of Total Sample Responding
National	25,000	28%
GOP	25,000	35%
Dem.	30,000	25%
Indep.	25,000	25%
March 2018		
National	25,000	
GOP	25,000	
Dem.	25,000	
Indep.	25,000	

So far, we have been looking at proposals for <u>reducing</u> the number of immigrants.

We will now look at a proposal for <u>increasing</u> the number of immigrants. This proposal calls for increasing the number of people that are provided green cards as part of a program that requires that applicants have skills that are needed in the US labor market. This includes immigrants who are skilled workers, professionals, executives, and people with exceptional abilities in various fields. In nearly all cases, applicants already have job offers in the US and the employers act as the sponsors.

The Department of Labor must then certify that:
- There are not available, qualified, and willing U.S. workers to fill the kind of position the immigrant would fill.
- Hiring a foreign worker will not have a negative effect on the wages and working conditions of similarly employed U.S. workers.

Currently, about 140,000 green cards are issued each year under this program. This number includes applicants as well as their immediate family members. About 10,000 of these green cards go to people who have the means to invest at least $500,000 in a new business that will create at least 10 jobs.

Here are some more arguments for and against this proposal.

Q27. Companies are asking for more skilled workers in the fields of finance and computer technology, so the United States can remain a leader in innovation and global competition. We have a shortage of nurses and other care workers such as those who provide assistance to the elderly, and it is anticipated that these shortages will increase as the baby boom generation retires. It is simply irrational and bad for our economy not to fill those jobs with qualified immigrants. Also, immigrants who come in under this program do not lower wages as employers legally have to pay them the same amount they pay citizens. This program also brings in investors who create jobs.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	26.3%	43.5%	**69.8%**	18.8%	10.5%	**29.3%**	0.8%
GOP	17.8%	42.5%	**60.3%**	25.2%	14.1%	**39.3%**	0.3%
Dem.	35.3%	44.1%	**79.4%**	11.5%	7.9%	**19.4%**	1.2%
Indep.	23.2%	44.2%	**67.4%**	22.6%	9.3%	**31.9%**	0.7%
March 2018							
National	25.0%	41.6%	**66.6%**	19.9%	13.1%	**33.0%**	0.5%
GOP	15.8%	42.1%	**57.9%**	22.7%	19.1%	**41.8%**	0.4%
Dem.	35.1%	43.3%	**78.4%**	15.0%	6.0%	**21.0%**	0.6%
Indep.	20.7%	36.7%	**57.4%**	25.2%	16.9%	**42.1%**	0.5%

Q28. Even if there are some temporarily open positions in the US economy, we should not give more immigrants green cards that allow them to stay in the US permanently. Rather, we should put more emphasis on educating Americans and do a better job of placing them in skilled jobs. Many of our college graduates are in jobs that don't even require a degree. Furthermore, it is not clear that there really is such a shortage of workers in these highly-skilled jobs. In some cases, the companies just want an oversupply of workers, so they do not have to pay them higher wages. As for investors, there have been a significant number of cases in which so-called investors made fraudulent claims about the amount of money invested or the number of jobs created.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	25.8%	36.6%	**62.4%**	23.5%	12.9%	**36.4%**	1.3%
GOP	37.7%	36.1%	**73.8%**	19.4%	6.6%	**26.0%**	0.2%
Dem.	18.3%	37.2%	**55.5%**	26.8%	16.1%	**42.9%**	1.5%
Indep.	19.8%	36.0%	**55.8%**	23.7%	17.8%	**41.5%**	2.6%
March 2018							
National	31.4%	35.3%	**66.7%**	21.9%	10.8%	**32.7%**	0.7%
GOP	40.4%	37.9%	**78.3%**	16.5%	4.8%	**21.3%**	0.4%
Dem.	20.0%	34.8%	**54.8%**	27.6%	16.8%	**44.4%**	0.8%
Indep.	38.8%	31.2%	**70.0%**	19.6%	9.3%	**28.9%**	1.1%

Q29. So, having considered these arguments, here is the proposal: increasing the number of green cards provided to immigrants who are selected because:
- the Department of Labor has certified that there is a need for their skill in the US economy and that hiring them will not have a negative effect on the wages for American workers
- they are investors that will invest at least $500,000 in the US and create at least 10 jobs

Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Refused / Don't know
National	5.0	42.1%	14.3%	43.0%	0.6%
GOP	4.5	46.6%	17.4%	35.8%	0.1%
Dem.	5.6	36.5%	11.9%	51.2%	0.5%
Indep.	4.8	45.7%	13.8%	38.9%	1.6%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q30. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't know
National	54.4%	44.1%	1.4%
GOP	45.8%	53.4%	0.7%
Dem.	62.7%	35.4%	1.8%
Indep.	52.7%	45.5%	1.8%
March 2018			
National	47.6%	51.1%	1.3%
GOP	35.0%	64.6%	0.4%
Dem.	62.9%	35.5%	1.6%
Indep.	38.4%	59.0%	2.6%

[THOSE WHO SAID "FAVOR" FOR Q30 WERE PRESENTED Q30A]
Q30a. Currently, there is a fixed maximum number of green cards granted under this program of 140,000. Do you think that:
1. this number should be raised to a higher number that stays fixed
2. this number should vary each year according to the demand for specific types of skilled workers in the US economy

	1. this number should be raised to a higher number that stays fixed	2. this number should vary each year according to the demand for specific types of skilled workers in the US economy	Refused / Don't know
National	6.0%	47.6%	0.8%
GOP	2.5%	43.0%	0.3%
Dem.	8.7%	52.7%	1.3%

Indep.	6.9%	45.4%	0.4%
March 2018			
National	6.1%	41.2%	0.2%
GOP	4.3%	30.7%	0.1%
Dem.	8.6%	53.8%	0.5%
Indep.	4.3%	34.1%	0.0%

[THOSE WHO SAID "OPPOSE" FOR Q30 WERE PRESENTED Q30B]

Q30b. Currently there is a fixed maximum number of green cards granted under this program of 140,000. Do you think that:
1. this number should stay fixed at 140,000
2. this number should vary each year according to the demand for specific types of skilled workers in the US economy, though the average level would not rise above 140,000

	1. this number should be raised to a higher number that stays fixed	2. this number should vary each year according to the demand for specific types of skilled workers in the US economy, though the average level would not rise above 140,000	Refused / Don't know
National	8.8%	33.9%	1.4%
GOP	5.7%	46.7%	1.0%
Dem.	10.9%	23.8%	0.7%
Indep.	9.9%	31.8%	3.8%
March 2018			
National	11.4%	38.5%	1.2%
GOP	12.8%	50.6%	1.1%
Dem.	9.2%	25.0%	1.4%
Indep.	13.7%	44.2%	1.1%

[FULL SAMPLE]

Another important issue is the role of migrants in farm work. Right now, there are about 2.2 million people who work on farms. Of these, approximately:
- 330,000 are US citizens
- 180,000 are permanent residents, i.e. green card holders
- 200,000 have special visas as guest workers
- 1.5 million are undocumented workers primarily from Mexico and Central America

Right now, there are no proposals for simply deporting the 1.5 million undocumented farm workers. Deporting large numbers of undocumented farm workers is strongly opposed by the farming industry.

But, there are some proposals to reduce the number of undocumented workers by replacing them with legal workers. This would be done by expanding the program that allows farmers to hire guest-workers from other countries for a limited amount of time, after which the guest-workers would be required to return to their home country for a period.

Currently, there is a visa system for farmers to hire migrants to work on their farms as guest workers for up to 10 months and, as mentioned above, currently there are 200,000 farm workers who have such visas. After the visa expires the workers can apply for extensions for up to three years after which they are required to return home for a period.

However, most farmers do not use this visa system, opting instead to hire undocumented workers which is less costly for them. The guest worker visa program requires that farmers pay workers about $11-14 per hours and to provide them housing and transportation. This is higher than the amount generally paid to undocumented workers, which is about $8 an hour, with no requirements to provide housing or transportation.

One proposal is to expand the guest worker visa program by lowering the requirements on farmers, making it more attractive for farmers to hire legal migrants. Under this proposal:
- farmers would be able to pay workers a minimum of $8.43 an hour;
- farmers would not be required to provide them housing or transportation; and
- the length of the visas would be extended from 10 to 18 months and can be renewed once, after which the immigrant must return to their home for a period.

This change would be coupled with a stronger effort to require employers to ensure that their workers are legal. Employers who intentionally hire undocumented workers would be subject to penalties, including fines and revoking of business licenses. Employers who persistently hire undocumented workers could be subject to prison time.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal.

Q34. Having so many illegal undocumented workers is not a good thing, but the fact is there is a demand for farm workers. Simply deporting them would be a huge blow to the farm industry and is not an option. We do have a guest worker program, but the current requirements are not realistic. It requires farmers to pay as much $5 an hour more than the actual labor market costs, so they do not use the program and simply hire undocumented workers. Farmers who do use the program are at a competitive disadvantage. If all farmers were to have to pay these higher costs, the price of food would go up, which would be a burden on American families, especially ones with low incomes. This proposed change to the guest worker program would allow for more competitive wages and remove the burdens of providing housing and transportation. This will make it possible for farmers to use the guest worker visa system. More legal employment means more local and state tax revenue, and also more protections for workers. Employers will have better access to a stable supply of workers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	24.6%	47.6%	72.2%	18.6%	7.8%	26.4%	1.3%
GOP	30.6%	45.2%	75.8%	16.7%	6.5%	23.2%	0.9%
Dem.	22.2%	48.7%	70.9%	19.9%	8.0%	27.9%	1.2%
Indep.	16.6%	50.5%	67.1%	20.0%	10.5%	30.5%	2.3%

Q35. Right now, farmers already have an option to hire foreign workers through the guest worker visa program and they should be required to use that system, rather than hiring undocumented workers. These proposed changes to the guest workers visa program will reduce wages and conditions for a group of people that work in some of the toughest conditions in the country, and that have for years provided this nation with an affordable source of food. Right now, there are over 500,000 legal workers, including US citizens, whose wages would be reduced by letting farmers hire foreigners to do back breaking work for very low wages. For somebody who is working here under the current guest workers system, sending money back home to their families, a decrease of up to $5 an hour will make it nearly impossible to afford short-term housing and transportation. Basically, this proposal is giving farmers the right to exploit both American and foreign farm workers by opening up the possibility of hiring unlimited numbers of foreign workers at exploitive wage levels.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	23.2%	38.8%	62.0%	26.1%	11.1%	37.2%	0.8%
GOP	18.7%	36.0%	54.7%	32.1%	12.8%	44.9%	0.4%
Dem.	29.1%	41.3%	70.4%	20.4%	8.5%	28.9%	0.7%
Indep.	19.0%	39.1%	58.1%	26.6%	13.5%	40.1%	1.7%

Q36. So, having heard these arguments, here again is the proposal:

The guest worker visa program that currently requires farmers to pay workers about $11-14 per hour and to provide them housing and transportation would be replaced by one that allows farmers to pay the workers a minimum of $8.43 an hour and removes the requirement to provide them housing or transportation. The length of the visas would be extended from 10 to 18 months, which can be renewed once for up to another 18 months, after which they would be required to return to their home country for a period. This change would be coupled with a stronger effort to require employers to ensure that their workers are legal by imposing penalties on employers who hire undocumented workers. Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Refused / Don't know
National	4.9	44.5%	16.4%	38.6%	0.5%
GOP	5.9	32.7%	14.7%	52.4%	0.2%
Dem.	4.2	54.2%	16.4%	28.7%	0.6%
Indep.	4.5	47.2%	19.8%	31.9%	1.1%

Q37. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't know
National	54.9%	43.4%	1.7%
GOP	68.8%	29.9%	1.4%
Dem.	43.3%	55.3%	1.4%
Indep.	52.2%	44.7%	3.1%

Besides farming, there are other industries that rely on temporary, often seasonal, labor, such as landscaping, construction, hotels, conservation, and amusement parks. Currently, there are several million undocumented workers working in these industries.

We would now like to consider a proposal for reducing the number of undocumented workers in these industries by bringing more of them into the legal immigration system.

Currently, to fill these temporary positions employers can request visas so that they can hire foreign workers on a temporary basis. However, they must first go through a process with the Department of Labor to try to hire American workers. Once it is determined that the workers are needed, the company can take applications from foreign workers. The workers are granted visas to come into the US and work for nine months.

Employers must pay the same prevailing rate as Americans are paid for the same work (determined by the Department of Labor (DoL) or an independent source approved by the DoL). Such visas are renewable for up to three years. After that the worker must return home for at least three months before reapplying. These workers are not allowed to collect any public benefits, but they do pay federal, state and local taxes.

These visas are called H-2B visas and up to 66,000 are issued annually. This number has varied depending on what Congress decides and has been both substantially higher and lower than the current number. Demand for these workers has gone up and down over the years. Right now, demand is high because of low unemployment.

Currently, there is a proposal in Congress to enable the Departments of Labor and Homeland Security to provide substantially more of these H-2B visas. In the current labor market this would likely increase the number of workers with such visas to about 200,000 and in future years could go higher. If the labor market were to change and more Americans were to want those jobs, the number would go down.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal.

Q38. The fact is that there are many industries in the United States that need immigrant labor which is why they currently hire millions of them. It would be much better if this process was done in a legal way. It is essential to ensure that American workers get the first crack at those jobs. It is also important that the workers are paid the kinds of wages that go to Americans so that the immigrant workers do not undercut American workers. All this can only be done if we have a legal system of guest workers. American companies don't want to break the law by hiring illegal immigrants, but they have to be provided a way to do it legally when there is the need for those workers. And if they have that option to do it legally it will be more feasible to put more pressure on them to stop hiring illegals. By bringing immigrant workers out of the shadows it will also be possible to get tax revenue from them, as well as to provide them protection from the abuses that are so common in the shadow economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	32.0%	47.5%	79.5%	13.5%	5.2%	18.7%	1.8%
GOP	32.9%	46.7%	79.6%	12.8%	6.2%	19.0%	1.4%
Dem.	32.9%	49.1%	82.0%	12.1%	3.9%	16.0%	2.0%
Indep.	27.6%	45.2%	72.8%	18.6%	6.1%	24.7%	2.5%

Q39. This whole idea of trying to solve the problem of illegal workers by replacing them with legal temporary workers fails to address the reason that illegal workers are a problem in the first place. Wages have been stagnant for decades now, especially in the lower wage industries that want to hire guest workers. It is Economics 101 that when wages are low it is because there is too big of a supply of workers. So many American workers have been frustrated in their effort to get a good job that the percentage of the population in

the workforce is historically low. None of these things will improve as long as there is a ready availability of illegal workers ready to take jobs at low wages and with few benefits. While advocates of this proposal for guest workers may claim that it will think of American workers first, the chances are that the government will think of corporations first, and the corporations want an oversupply of labor so that they can keep wages low. That means they will pressure the government to look the other way and let the corporations hire guest workers who will undercut American workers, even when there are American workers still in need of a good-paying job.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	19.8%	35.5%	55.3%	30.6%	13.1%	43.7%	1.0%
GOP	23.4%	34.9%	58.3%	31.0%	9.6%	40.6%	1.1%
Dem.	18.9%	34.9%	53.8%	30.8%	15.1%	45.9%	0.4%
Indep.	14.1%	38.2%	52.3%	29.0%	16.2%	45.2%	2.5%

Q40. So, here again is the proposal:

Making it possible to substantially increase the number of temporary work visas, called H-2B visas, for industries that rely on temporary, often seasonal, labor, such as landscaping, construction, hotels, conservation, and amusement parks. Such increases would only be allowed if the government determines that there are no American workers who want those jobs and employers pay the same wage that is paid to American workers in those jobs. Guest workers are not allowed to collect any public benefits, but they do pay federal, state and local taxes and are required to periodically return to their home country. Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Refused / Don't know
National	5.6	31.6%	16.0%	51.2%	1.2%
GOP	6.0	26.7%	14.3%	58.0%	1.0%
Dem.	5.5	33.4%	17.3%	48.1%	1.3%
Indep.	5.1	38.0%	16.8%	43.7%	1.5%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q41. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't know
National	69.1%	29.0%	1.9%
GOP	73.3%	25.2%	1.6%
Dem.	67.1%	31.1%	1.8%
Indep.	64.8%	32.4%	2.9%

Another major proposal that seeks to discourage illegal immigration is to require employers to use a government system to verify that the people they hire have the legal right to work in the US (by being a citizen, having a green card, or having a work visa).

Here is how this would work:

The employer would be required to go to an existing government website, called E-Verify, where the employer can enter the name and Social Security number of the people they want to hire. The website then verifies whether or not each employee has a legal right to work. All new job applicants would need to be checked out as well. Employers who do not verify their employees and are found to be employing undocumented immigrants will be fined. Employers who repeatedly fail to use the verification system and hire undocumented immigrants may be sentenced to up to 18 months in prison and their business license may be revoked.

Right now, federal contractors and subcontractors are already required to use the E-Verify system to verify the legality of their employees. Also, a few states require it. Here are some arguments for and against this proposal.

Q42. The primary reason that people immigrate to the US illegally is because they are looking for a job. The reason that the US is such a job magnet is that so many employers do not bother to check whether the people they employ are legal--often turning a blind eye because they want to pay the lower wages that illegal immigrants will accept. Honest employers who do check to make sure their employees are legal are put at a disadvantage. This clearly needs to stop. All US employers should be required to verify that their employees are legal.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	48.2%	31.4%	**79.6%**	13.1%	6.5%	**19.6%**	0.8%
GOP	60.4%	25.1%	**85.5%**	9.6%	4.2%	**13.8%**	0.7%
Dem.	39.7%	37.9%	**77.6%**	14.3%	7.3%	**21.6%**	0.8%
Indep.	42.0%	29.5%	**71.5%**	17.9%	9.5%	**27.4%**	1.1%

Q43. Employers should not have the responsibility to enforce US immigration laws. It is also costly for the employer. According to one study, requiring employers to use E-Verify would cost small businesses $2.7 billion to implement, an average of $127 per new employee. It is the government's job to ensure that illegal immigrants do not come into the US in the first place, rather than expecting employers to police them.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	16.7%	26.7%	**43.4%**	26.3%	29.2%	**55.5%**	1.1%
GOP	14.0%	21.6%	**35.6%**	26.2%	37.4%	**63.6%**	0.8%
Dem.	19.7%	30.1%	**49.8%**	26.8%	22.1%	**48.9%**	1.2%
Indep.	15.2%	29.5%	**44.7%**	25.0%	28.5%	**53.5%**	1.7%

Q44. Approximately 7 million illegal immigrants hold jobs in the U.S. At the same time there are 23 million American citizens and legal residents who are currently unemployed or can't find full-time work. This is not right. Requiring employers to verify that their employees can work legally, would open up millions of jobs for citizens and legal immigrants, lowering their unemployment rate. Our first responsibility should be to ensure that legal workers have a job.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	37.2%	33.7%	**70.9%**	18.3%	8.1%	**26.4%**	2.7%
GOP	51.0%	32.3%	**83.3%**	11.3%	3.0%	**14.3%**	2.3%
Dem.	26.1%	35.1%	**61.2%**	23.9%	11.9%	**35.8%**	2.9%
Indep.	33.3%	33.2%	**66.5%**	20.1%	10.3%	**30.4%**	3.1%

Q45. The idea that the government is going to effectively keep track of who is and who isn't legal is really dubious. There are many cases of the E-Verify system saying that someone is not legal, when they really are. For example, this can happen when someone changes their name--something that is particularly likely to happen to women. Also, the idea that driving illegal immigrants out of their jobs is going to free up jobs for Americans is doubtful. Americans do not want many of the jobs they take --like farm work--and driving them out will likely lead to major labor shortages that will hurt American businesses.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	17.6%	37.5%	**55.1%**	25.9%	16.5%	**42.4%**	2.6%
GOP	7.5%	32.0%	**39.5%**	30.8%	27.6%	**58.4%**	2.1%
Dem.	28.3%	41.6%	**69.9%**	20.4%	6.9%	**27.3%**	2.8%
Indep.	14.0%	39.8%	**53.8%**	28.3%	14.9%	**43.2%**	3.1%

Q46. The E-Verify system has proven to work very well. An overwhelming 87% of employers who use the system report satisfaction. There have been few cases of legal workers being flagged as illegal. In any case, as we make a commitment to use the system and it plays a more important role, improvements will be made and new technology will raise the performance level every year just as is the case with all technology. It can also catch people who are already here, which other systems, like a wall, cannot do. And its cost for taxpayers is quite low.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	33.8%	43.8%	**77.6%**	14.0%	5.0%	**19.0%**	3.4%
GOP	42.2%	42.7%	**84.9%**	9.3%	2.8%	**12.1%**	3.0%
Dem.	29.2%	45.9%	**75.1%**	15.5%	5.8%	**21.3%**	3.6%
Indep.	26.2%	41.1%	**67.3%**	21.3%	8.0%	**29.3%**	3.4%

Q47. While the E-Verify system sounds good on paper it can be easily fooled. A government funded study found that E-Verify mistakenly approved of 54 percent of unauthorized immigrants, mostly due to the fraudulent use of Social Security numbers. Such numbers are readily available on the black market from people who, for example, find ones associated with people who have died. Also, employers can evade some E-Verify requirements by hiring people as contractors rather than employees, which is probably why states that currently have E-Verify mandates have seen increases in the use of contractors.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	16.6%	43.5%	**60.1%**	26.7%	9.7%	**36.4%**	3.5%
GOP	12.6%	41.9%	**54.5%**	28.5%	14.3%	**42.8%**	2.7%
Dem.	21.2%	44.2%	**65.4%**	25.7%	5.3%	**31.0%**	3.6%
Indep.	14.3%	45.2%	**59.5%**	25.2%	10.4%	**35.6%**	4.9%

Q48. So, here again is the proposal.

All employers must use the E-Verify system to verify that current employees and all new job applicants have the legal right to work in the US. Employers who do not verify their employees and are found to be employing undocumented immigrants will be fined. Employers who repeatedly fail to use the verification system and hire undocumented immigrants may be sentenced up to 18 months in prison and their business license may be revoked. Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Refused / Don't know
National	6.1	30.9%	13.3%	55.0%	0.9%
GOP	7.0	20.9%	10.1%	68.4%	0.6%
Dem.	5.5	36.8%	16.9%	45.7%	0.6%
Indep.	5.5	38.7%	11.8%	47.4%	2.1%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q49. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't know
National	72.0%	26.1%	1.9%
GOP	82.6%	16.5%	0.9%
Dem.	65.5%	32.3%	2.2%
Indep.	64.1%	32.6%	3.4%

[SAMPLE A]
Another issue related to illegal immigration is a proposal for the US to spend $25 billion to build a barrier along the US southern border with Mexico, primarily by building a wall. This border is 1,195 miles long.

The US government currently spends about $3.8 billion per year policing the southern border. In 2016, 409,000 people were caught and prevented from crossing the border. However, the Department of Homeland Security estimates that 170,000 succeeded in entering illegally.

Not all of these are people who are seeking to cross the border are seeking to immigrate into the US. Some are smugglers.

There are different ideas about how this $25 billion should be spent. Some say that there should be a solid wall along the full length of 1,195 miles. Others say that this poses many engineering challenges, particularly in mountainous areas and that in some areas it is better to have fences, or just more intensive surveillance. The question we would like you to evaluate is whether the US should invest $25 billion, over and above current spending on border security, to create a stronger barrier on the southern border, primarily by building a wall.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal.

Q50. Spending $25 billion on securing our southern border is a good investment. Every day hundreds of immigrants succeed in entering the US illegally through the southern border. Many are immigrants who come here and use government social services, in

addition to taking jobs that should be going to American citizens. Many are criminals, bringing in drugs and undermining the fabric of our society. Some are members of terrorist groups. New research suggests that the large build-up in border security and enforcement in the last decade contributed to the decline in illegal crossings. By preventing large numbers of economic migrants from crossing, our border patrol agents can focus more of their resources on the most serious traffickers causing the most harm. Ultimately we need to recognize that a nation is only as strong as its borders. A country that can so easily be entered is a weak country. We need to make a statement to the world that we are in control of our destiny.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	30.3%	18.8%	**49.1%**	13.5%	35.5%	**49.0%**	1.9%
GOP	61.5%	20.7%	**82.2%**	8.9%	7.7%	**16.6%**	1.2%
Dem.	8.9%	15.4%	**24.3%**	12.6%	61.2%	**73.8%**	1.9%
Indep.	17.5%	22.7%	**40.2%**	24.1%	32.4%	**56.5%**	3.4%
March 2018							
National	31.6%	20.2%	**51.8%**	14.3%	33.1%	**47.4%**	0.9%
GOP	57.1%	26.8%	**83.9%**	8.7%	6.9%	**15.6%**	0.5%
Dem.	7.1%	13.0%	**20.1%**	19.1%	60.4%	**79.5%**	0.5%
Indep.	35.2%	23.1%	**58.3%**	14.7%	24.5%	**39.2%**	2.5%

Q51. Building a wall sounds bold and dramatic, but, realistically, it will not significantly reduce the number of people crossing the border illegally. Walls can be scaled with ladders. More importantly, if one route is blocked people will use others already in use. Hundreds of tunnels have been dug under the border. People can be smuggled by boat. People can be hidden in trucks and vans crossing the border, as there is no way that the border guards can check all of the millions of vehicles that cross over every month. Surely, there are a lot of big companies out there eager for the opportunity to get lucrative contracts building such a wall, but in the end we will see it was all just a boondoggle. If we want to get serious about reducing the number of people coming here illegally, there are more effective means, like discouraging them from coming by making sure that employers do not hire them once they get here.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	37.2%	26.2%	**63.4%**	14.8%	20.5%	**35.3%**	1.3%
GOP	14.6%	24.9%	**39.5%**	22.1%	37.4%	**59.5%**	0.9%
Dem.	58.7%	25.1%	**83.8%**	7.3%	7.8%	**15.1%**	1.1%
Indep.	33.4%	30.9%	**64.3%**	17.0%	16.1%	**33.1%**	2.6%
March 2018							
National	37.4%	26.8%	**64.2%**	16.0%	19.1%	**35.1%**	0.7%
GOP	14.7%	24.7%	**39.4%**	26.3%	33.9%	**60.2%**	0.4%
Dem.	61.5%	25.9%	**87.4%**	6.8%	5.5%	**12.3%**	0.3%
Indep.	29.0%	33.0%	**62.0%**	16.0%	19.6%	**35.6%**	2.3%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q52. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose the government spending $25 billion to build a stronger barrier along the US southern border with Mexico, primarily by building a wall.

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't know
National	39.0%	59.1%	1.9%
GOP	74.1%	23.8%	2.2%
Dem.	13.3%	85.4%	1.3%
Indep.	28.2%	68.9%	3.0%
March 2018			
National	41.0%	58.2%	0.8%
GOP	78.1%	21.4%	0.5%
Dem.	6.7%	92.7%	0.5%
Indep.	43.5%	54.5%	2.0%

[THOSE WHO SAID "OPPOSE" FOR Q52 WERE PRESENTED Q53]
Q53. Would you favor spending on the southern border:
    1. No more than the current $3.8 billion per year on policing the border

2. An additional one-time amount to build a stronger barrier, but less than additional $25 billion proposed

	1. No more than the current $3.8 billion per year on policing the border	2. An additional one-time amount to build a stronger barrier, but less than additional $25 billion proposed	Refused / Don't know
National	48.8%	9.0%	1.3%
GOP	13.0%	10.2%	0.6%
Dem.	76.4%	8.1%	0.9%
Indep.	56.8%	8.8%	3.3%
March 2018			
National	46.7%	10.4%	1.1%
GOP	14.6%	6.5%	0.3%
Dem.	78.1%	12.8%	1.9%
Indep.	40.5%	13.0%	1.0%

[THOSE WHO SAID "An additional one-time amount…" FOR Q53 WERE PRESENTED Q54]
Q54. How much would you favor spending on building a stronger barrier? Please write your number in billions of dollars. You can also enter a fraction of a billion. (For example, if you want to put $250 million, then enter 0.25) _____?

	Median	% of Total Sample Responding
National	0.5	8%
GOP	5.0	8%
Dem.	0.25	8%
Indep.	0.23	8%
March 2018		
National	5.0	
GOP	6.0	
Dem.	5.0	
Indep.	5.0	

[SAMPLE B]
As you may know there is a major discussion these days about what should happen to people who were brought into the US as minors and never got legal status, but have lived here some years.

In 2012, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, popularly known as DACA, was established to allow these people (commonly referred to as 'Dreamers') to apply for a special status so that they:
- receive temporary protection from being deported
- can get a work permit

Provided that they:
- were under age 31 when the program started in 2012
- are age 15 or older
- have continuously resided in the US since 2007
- were in the country without authorization in 2012
- have not been convicted of a serious crime
- are in school, have graduated from high school, are in the military, or have been honorably discharged from the military.

The DACA status expires after two years, but can be renewed provided that the person continue to meet the requirements and has not committed a significant crime. People with DACA status are not currently allowed to apply for a green card or citizenship while they are in the US under this program.

Approximately 900,000 young people applied for DACA and approximately 700,000 currently have it. It is estimated that between 500,000 and 1,100,000 more are either:
- eligible but have not yet applied (presumably because they were afraid that revealing their illegal presence to the government might someday become a problem for them),
- had DACA status but did not renew it after it expired,
- could be eligible in the future when they are old enough or meet its educational requirements.

As you may know, for a short period the DACA program was stopped, but was then reinstated by a federal court decision.

We will now consider two proposals for how to deal with young people who were brought to the US illegally as minors.

Here is how the first proposal goes:

People who entered the country illegally under the age of 18 will be able to apply for a special eight year green card, provided that they:
- Have not committed any significant crimes or pose a threat to national security; and
- Are currently enrolled in school or have received their high school diploma

After eight years, they will be able to apply for a permanent green card so long as they have:
- Remained within the United States since being granted their conditional green card; and
- Either completed at least two years of college, served at least two years in the military, or have been employed continuously for a total of at least three years (with exceptions for people who have a disability, or are full-time caregivers with a minor child).

Once granted a permanent green card, after another five years they may apply for citizenship.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal. Please select how convincing you find them.

Q55. We must recognize that these young people grew up here, have become part of American society and make their contribution and pay taxes just like the rest of us. It is not their fault that their parents brought them here. The current program that gives them a few years reprieve is no solution, leaving them in a limbo state where they cannot really be sure they will be able to stay. America is their home and they are not criminals. They need to settle in and move on with their lives, building their careers and families, not worrying if this program might suddenly be ended. It makes no sense and is very unfair to send them off to a country that they have not lived in since they were children. It is time for us to make a final and long term plan for fully accepting them into American society.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	45.6%	30.6%	**76.2%**	13.2%	9.5%	**22.7%**	1.0%
GOP	25.7%	38.4%	**64.1%**	20.2%	15.3%	**35.5%**	0.4%
Dem.	65.8%	23.1%	**88.9%**	6.1%	3.6%	**9.7%**	1.4%
Indep.	42.2%	30.6%	**72.8%**	14.7%	10.9%	**25.6%**	1.7%

Q56. We must remember that by coming to the US without a visa the law was broken. We should not reward such illegal behavior. That would simply be amnesty. If we give DACA recipients a special path to citizenship, we will encourage others to break the law too. This plan will also make it easier for immigrants who came here illegally as children to compete with young American citizens. This might be good for corporations who want an oversupply of workers so they can pay them less and offer little to no benefits, but it is bad for young Americans who are already having a hard time. Just recently, the unemployment rate for 18-29-year-olds reached a whopping 11% and many more are underemployed. A recent study found that on average they earn 20% less than their baby-boomer parents did at the same age and have more student debt. This is no time to introduce a surge of new young people into the legal job market.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	19.7%	26.2%	**45.9%**	27.2%	26.6%	**53.8%**	0.2%
GOP	30.4%	33.5%	**63.9%**	25.8%	10.2%	**36.0%**	0.1%
Dem.	9.5%	17.6%	**27.1%**	29.6%	42.9%	**72.5%**	0.4%
Indep.	20.0%	30.7%	**50.7%**	24.5%	24.8%	**49.3%**	0.0%

Q57. So how acceptable do you find this proposal?

People who entered the country illegally under the age of 18 will be able to apply for a special eight year green card provided they have not committed any crimes or pose no security threat. After that they can apply for a green card provided they have completed two years of college, served in the military or worked full-time for three years, and have not committed any crimes or pose any security threat. After another five years they can apply for citizenship. Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Refused / Don't know
National	6.1	30.3%	11.3%	58.2%	0.2%
GOP	5.7	32.6%	12.1%	55.3%	0.0%
Dem.	6.7	26.1%	9.3%	64.5%	0.1%
Indep.	5.5	36.2%	14.9%	47.9%	1.1%

Now, here is the second proposal:

As mentioned previously, approximately 700,000 young people currently have DACA status, though there are between 500,000 and 1,100,000 additional young people who were brought to the US as minors and do not have DACA status for a variety of reasons.

According to this second proposal, no additional people would be able to apply for DACA status.

The 700,000 people who currently have DACA status would receive a temporary legal status for another three years. After that they may reapply if they have met certain requirements. Renewal would not be assured and would require the approval of the Secretary of Homeland Security. They would not be allowed to apply for a green card or citizenship while they are in the US under this program. The roughly 500,000 to 1,100,000 young people who were brought here illegally as minors but do not currently have DACA status would be subject to deportation.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal.

Q59. Letting almost 700,000 young people with DACA status stay for another 3 years, with the possibility of renewal is a generous gesture. Though it is not assured, many of them would probably get renewals. They would also have the option of going to the back of the line and applying for a green card and a pathway to citizenship, just like everybody else. But they should not have a special path to a green card. The people who would be subject to deportation would also have the option of applying for a green card, but with no special privileges. Most were given a chance to apply for DACA, but did not apply or failed to renew when they were eligible to do so. The bottom line is that when they came here they were breaking the law and that should not be rewarded with a path to citizenship. Giving almost half of them a renewable status for 3 years at a time is generous enough.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	19.9%	31.8%	**51.7%**	26.4%	20.8%	**47.2%**	1.1%
GOP	34.5%	39.9%	**74.4%**	18.0%	6.8%	**24.8%**	0.8%
Dem.	7.4%	23.5%	**30.9%**	34.0%	33.4%	**67.4%**	1.7%
Indep.	15.7%	33.9%	**49.6%**	27.6%	22.8%	**50.4%**	0.0%

Q60. The idea that we are going to deport hundreds of thousands of people who have lived here since they were children is unrealistic and inhumane. It has been estimated that this would cost $4 to $6 billion. Furthermore, we have invested a lot as a society to educate them and it makes no sense to prevent them from making their contribution as adults. Also, many of them have US-born children (and are now citizens) who would have to either uproot their lives as well or be left living with relatives. As for giving some of them a permit to stay for 3 years with uncertainty about the possibility of renewal, this just kicks the can down the road. If it's wrong to deport them now it will be wrong to deport them then. So, we need to go ahead and do the right thing and give them a realistic path to citizenship, provided that they have a clean record and make a contribution to society.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	39.4%	32.9%	**72.3%**	14.3%	12.7%	**27.0%**	0.7%
GOP	18.1%	40.2%	**58.3%**	21.3%	19.9%	**41.2%**	0.6%
Dem.	60.9%	26.5%	**87.4%**	6.8%	4.9%	**11.7%**	0.8%
Indep.	35.6%	31.2%	**66.8%**	16.8%	15.5%	**32.3%**	0.8%

Q61. Now that you have considered these arguments, we would like you to evaluate the proposal.

The almost 700,000 people who currently have DACA status would receive a temporary legal status for three years. They may also apply for extensions for an additional three years, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Homeland Security. They would not be provided any special path to a green card or citizenship.

The roughly 500,000 to 1,100,000 young people who were brought here as minors but do not currently have DACA status for a variety of reasons, would not have legal status and would be subject to deportation. Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Refused / Don't know
National	4.2	51.9%	16.4%	31.4%	0.3%
GOP	5.3	35.7%	20.5%	43.1%	0.7%
Dem.	3.2	65.1%	12.1%	22.7%	0.1%
Indep.	3.8	58.1%	17.8%	24.1%	0.0%

[FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q62. Now, having considered these different proposals, which of the following do you think is the best policy?

1. The current program: This allows those who were brought into the country illegally as minors before 2007 to apply for a legal status allowing them to stay and work. The DACA status expires after two years, but can be renewed provided that the person continues to meet the requirements and has not committed a significant crime. People with DACA status are not currently allowed to apply for a green card or citizenship while they are in the US under this program.

2. First proposal: Allow those who were brought into the country illegally as minors to apply for a special eight year green card if they have not committed any crimes or pose no security threat. After that they can apply for a green card if they have completed two years of college, served in the military, or worked for three years. After another five years they can apply for citizenship.

3. Second proposal: No additional people would be able to apply for DACA status, but the 700,000 people who currently have DACA status would continue to have it for another three years. They may also apply for extensions for additional three-year periods, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Homeland Security. They would not be allowed to apply for a green card or citizenship while they are in the US under this program. The roughly 500,000 to 1,100,000 young people who were brought here illegally as minors but do not currently have DACA status would be subject to deportation.

	1. The current program	2. First proposal	3. Second proposal	Refused / Don't know
National	10.5%	55.5%	22%	12.3%
GOP	5.4%	47.2%	36%	11.8%
Dem.	14.4%	64.8%	8%	13.2%
Indep.	13.0%	51.3%	25%	10.8%